



REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 15, 2004. In that action: claims 8-10, 14-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dourish, et al. (USPN 6,430,757) and claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dourish.

Claims 8-11, 14-16, and 18-21 are pending in this application. Claims 8 and 15 have been amended to even further distinguish over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection of the pending claims is hereby requested.

Each of the pending claims has been rejected as anticipated by or obvious in light of Dourish. Dourish appears to disclose a collaborative document management system with customizable filing structures that are mutually intelligible. A document store on a network server stores a multitude of documents but allows a number of different users to access the documents. Apparently, the documents may include word processing documents, spreadsheets, and other types of documents such as drawings. The teaching of Dourish does not limit the access of various users to various documents. Instead, the teaching of Dourish allows the documents to be categorized in different customized manners depending on a hierarchy associated with the particular user. In other words, certain subgroups of users may be able to view a particular customized organization of documents while other subgroups of users may not be able to view that particular customized organization of the documents. There appears to be no mention, however, of limiting access by any particular user to any particular document.

Amended claims 8 and 15, on the other hand, are directed to providing limited access to address entries in the shared directory environment. A request from an entity for a view of one


more address entries may result in access being denied to that first view and instead presenting to the one or more entities initiating the query only those address entries in directory which include hierarchical information associated with the requesting entity.

Thus, it can be seen that, unlike Dourish, the present invention does restrict access to certain address entries. Dourish, on the other hand, only restricts access to certain customized organizations of the documents in the database. Accordingly, it can be seen that the pending claims differ from Dourish in at least two important respects. First of all, Dourish relates to documents while the present invention relates to address entries. Second, Dourish relates to restricting access to customized organizations of documents while the present invention relates to restricting access to the address entries themselves, rather than organizations thereof. For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is neither anticipated nor obvious in light of Dourish.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 
Robert G. Crouch
Registration No. 34,806
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(720) 562-5506

Date: December 15, 2004